

HANUSZ LAW, PC  
John Hanusz (SBN 277367)  
553 South Marengo Avenue  
Pasadena, California 91101  
Telephone: (213) 204-4200  
john@hanuszlaw.com

Counsel for Akop Kantrdzyan

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

AKOP KANTRDZYAN,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 24CR-00418-SVW

**UNOPPOSED *EX PARTE*  
APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO  
CONTINUE TRIAL, OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, FOR A STATUS  
CONFERENCE; DECLARATION  
OF COUNSEL**

[Proposed Order Filed Concurrently]

Akop Kantrdzyan, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby moves the Court for an order continuing trial in this matter to June 5, 2025. The reason for this request is that Mr. Kantrdzyan's potentially dispositive motion to dismiss will not be heard until January 13, 2025, two weeks prior to the current trial date of January 28, 2025 – and after the remainder of the current pretrial deadlines. The Court's ruling on the motion will impact the likelihood of a pretrial resolution of this matter. Accordingly, in order to conserve the resources of the Court (and the parties) and avoid potentially unnecessary trial-related litigation, Mr. Kantrdzyan respectfully requests that the Court reconsider its ruling denying the parties' joint request to continue trial in this matter so that the dispositive

1 motion may be heard in advance of the remaining case deadlines. In the  
2 alternative, Mr. Kantrdzyan requests that the Court schedule a status conference  
3 for the parties to discuss scheduling with the Court. The parties are available on  
4 November 26 (after 12:00 p.m.), November 27, December 2, December 3, and  
5 December 4, 2024 (except 10:00 a.m.).

6 This *ex parte* application is based on the attached Declaration of Counsel.  
7 The government does not oppose this application.

8  
9 Dated: November 25, 2024      Respectfully submitted,

10  
11 s/ John Hanusz

12 John Hanusz

13 Counsel for Akop Kantrdzyan  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DECLARATION OF COUNSEL**

I, John Hanusz, do hereby declare and state:

1. I represent Akop Kantrdzyan in this matter. I am licensed to practice law in the State of California, and am admitted to practice before this Court.
2. Mr. Kantrdzyan was arrested in this matter on June 14, 2024, and was indicted for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). He was released on bond, and has been in compliance with all conditions of release.
3. Pursuant to a stipulation by the parties, the Court ordered trial to commence on January 28, 2025. Dkt. No. 48. Under that scheduling order, pretrial motions are due to be filed on December 9, 2024, with oppositions due December 23, 2024, and replies due on January 6, 2025. *Id.*
4. On October 28, 2024, I filed a motion to dismiss the indictment as unconstitutional as applied to Mr. Kantrdzyan, calendaring the motion to be heard on November 25, 2024. Dkt. No. 49. I concurrently filed a motion to stay pending the Ninth Circuit's *en banc* consideration of *United States v. Duarte*, Case No. 22-50048, a matter presenting issues relevant to Mr. Kantrdzyan's case. That court is scheduled to hear oral argument next month.
5. On November 20, 2024, the parties filed a stipulation to continue trial to June 3, 2025. Dkt. No. 55.
6. On November 21, 2024, the court continued the November 25, 2024 motion hearing to January 6, 2025. Dkt. No. 56. I asked the Court to continue the matter for an additional week, as I will be out of the country on that date. The Court continued the hearing to January 13, 2025. Dkt. No. 57. Later that day, the Court denied the parties' request to continue trial. Dkt. No. 58.
7. Given the impending trial deadlines, and the fact that what may be a dispositive motion is not scheduled to be heard until after those deadlines,

1 I respectfully request that the Court reconsider the denial of the parties'  
2 request to continue trial, so that the dispositive motion may be heard in  
3 advance of the other pretrial deadlines (the parties proposed that those  
4 deadlines been continued to January and February 2025). The Court's  
5 ruling on the motion will likely affect the progression of this case, and  
6 may be determinative of whether the matter proceeds to trial or resolves.  
7 Otherwise, the parties will continue to proceed pursuant to the current trial  
8 schedule, which may well cause the Court (and the parties) to expend  
9 resources unnecessarily while the dispositive motion is pending.

10 8. To the extent that the Court is inclined to continue to deny the request to  
11 continue the trial date, I respectfully request that court hold a status  
12 conference with the parties to discuss scheduling. The parties are available  
13 on November 26 (after 12:00 p.m.), November 27, December 2, December  
14 3, and December 4, 2024 (except 10:00 a.m.).

15 9. I have communicated with Assistant United States Attorney Diane Roldan,  
16 who represents the government in this matter, regarding the relief sought  
17 in this request. Ms. Roldan indicated that the government does not oppose  
18 this request.

19 Executed this, the 25th day of November, 2024 at Pasadena, California.

20  
21 s/ John Hanusz

22 John Hanusz  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28